

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the parent case Serial No. 09/861,452, the Examiner indicated claim 25 contained allowable subject matter, but rejected all other claims. In this continuation application and preliminary amendment, Applicants re-submit originally filed claims 1-21, with claims 1-3, 5-8, and 10-18 being amended, and submit new claims 22-27. Based on the reasons stated herein, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-27 are patentable.

As amended, claim 1 requires, among other limitations, “generating a first summary cube at a first level of abstraction based on the volume cube” and further requires “using a first summary cube to perform diagonal aggregation without rollup.” Applicants do not find this limitation in the art of record from the parent case (*i.e.*, Osmar, et al.). At least for this reason, claim 1 and dependent claims 2-10 are patentable.

As amended, claim 11 requires, among other limitations, “generating a high diagonal cube to represent the summary information.” Claim 11 further requires “using the high diagonal cube to perform diagonal aggregation without rollup” and still further requires “generating high profile cubes based on elements of the high diagonal cube.” The art of record does not teach or suggest these limitations. At least for this reason, claim 11, dependent claims 12-17 and new dependent claims 22-23 are patentable.

As amended, claim 18 requires, among other limitations, “a diagonal aggregation facility that assists the web access analysis program by generating a high diagonal cube” and further requires that “the high diagonal cube performs diagonal aggregation without rollup.” These limitations are not taught or suggested by the art of record. At least for this reason, claim 18, dependent claims 19-21 and new dependent claim 24 are patentable.

With reference to new claim 25, the art of record fails to teach or suggest “a computer readable medium containing instructions that, when executed by a processor, cause the processor to,” among other things, “generate a high diagonal cube based on the summary information.” Claim 25 further requires “the high diagonal cube to perform diagonal aggregation without rollup.” New claim 25 and new dependent claims 26-27 are allowable at least for this reason.

As is seen in the amendments above, other amendments have been made to various of the claims and such amendments do not narrow the scope of the claims. For instance, reference to labels such as "a)" and "b)" have been omitted so as not to imply an order to the method actions. Further, references to "the steps of" have been removed to ensure that the claims are not interpreted under 35 U.S.C. § 112, sixth paragraph.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims. In the course of the foregoing discussions, Applicants may have at times referred to claim limitations in shorthand fashion, or may have focused on a particular claim element. This discussion should not be interpreted to mean that the other limitations can be ignored or dismissed. The claims must be viewed as a whole, and each limitation of the claims must be considered when determining the patentability of the claims. Moreover, it should be understood that there may be other distinctions between the claims and the prior art which have yet to be raised, but which may be raised in the future.

If any fees or time extensions are inadvertently omitted or if any fees have been overpaid, please appropriately charge or credit those fees to Hewlett-Packard Company Deposit Account Number 08-2025 and enter any time extension(s) necessary to prevent this case from being abandoned.

Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,



Jonathan M. Harris

PTO Reg. No. 44,144

CONLEY ROSE, P.C.

(713) 238-8000 (Phone)

(713) 238-8008 (Fax)

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
Legal Dept., M/S 35
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400